

Docket No.: 4492-0130PUS1
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Akiyoshi FUJIHARA

Application No.: 10/547,682

Confirmation No.: 7196

Filed: September 2, 2005

Art Unit: 2155

For: LINE CONCENTRATOR, NETWORK-
COMPATIBLE APPARATUSES AND
COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

Examiner: M. Y. Won

AMENDMENT IN RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

MS Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

In response to the Examiner's amendment dated August 13, 2008, please amend the above-identified U.S. patent application as follows:

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims which begins on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 5 of this paper.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

1. (Currently Amended) A line concentrator having a plurality of communication ports for relaying transmissions of communication data exchanged among network-compatible apparatuses connected through the communication ports, comprising:

a response storage portion for storing specific response request information and corresponding response information in association with each other;

a destination information storage portion for storing destination information of the network-compatible apparatuses connected through the communication ports individually for part or all of the communication ports;

a response necessity information storage portion for storing response necessity information indicating whether it is necessary to perform a specific response operation or not for each piece of the destination information; and

a control unit for performing:

a communication data judgment operation for judging whether the communication data is

a first communication data which can be answered by returning a proxy response, the first communication data containing, as well as the response request information stored in the response storage portion, a destination included in the destination information stored in the destination storage portion and the response necessity information indicating that it is necessary to respond,

a second communication data which can not be answered by returning a proxy response, the second communication data not containing the response request information stored in the response storage portion, or

an unanswerable communication data other than the first and second communication data;

a transmission prohibit operation for prohibiting signal transmission to the communication port connected to the network-compatible apparatus corresponding to the destination information for which the response necessity

information indicates that it is necessary to respond in the case of the ~~unanswerable communication data and the~~ first communication data; and a proxy response operation for transmitting the response information corresponding to the response request information contained in the first communication data to the network-compatible apparatus from which the first communication data has been sent,

wherein the network compatible apparatus comprises a signal monitoring section for detecting signal transmission from the line concentrator during a power save mode and causing a power supply to transfer to the a normal mode when the signal transmission is detected regardless of signal content.

2. (Original) The line concentrator as recited in claim 1, wherein if the communication data is the second communication data, the control unit transmits a specific signal to the communication port connected to the network-compatible apparatus that is a destination of the second communication data and transmits a specific response to the communication port after receiving a specific response to the transmitted signal.

3. (Original) The line concentrator as recited in claim 1, wherein the response storage portion stores the response request information and the response information individually for part or all of the communication ports.

4-5. (Withdrawn)

6. (Previously Presented) A communication system employing one or more line concentrators as recited in any one of claims 1 through 3.

7. (Previously Presented) A communication system as in claim 6 further comprising the network-compatible apparatus, comprising:

a communication port that is connected to the line concentrator; and

the power supply for supplying electric power suited for normal mode and electric power suited for power save mode.

8. (Previously Presented) A communication system as in claim 7 further comprising a response information transmission unit for transmitting specific response request information and corresponding response information to the line concentrator.

REMARKS**Amendment to claims should be entered:**

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the amendment agreed upon by the Applicant's representative and the Examiner. Thus, the amendment to claims should be entered.

The Examiner may refer to the facsimile dated July 30, 2008, where this claim amendment now correctly recites the claim amendment discussed. The claims are amended based on the Examiner's Amendment of August 13, 2008 being entered. Therefore, the amendment to claims should be entered.

The Applicant only authorized the proposed claim changes as submitted in the facsimile dated July 30, 2008. The facsimile states: "the Applicant has authorized the proposed claim changes in an Examiner's amendment, only if the proposed claim set is to be allowed." Therefore, the amendment to claims should be entered.

Formal Restriction Requirement made of record:

The Examiner stated that claims 4-5 are to be canceled because they are independent and distinct inventions from the invention of claims 1-3 and 6-8, thus, subject to a Restriction Requirement. The Examiner indicated a formal Restriction Requirement will be included with the Examiner's Amendment. The Examiner has not provided the formal Restriction Requirement.

Upon contingency of entering the correct amendments to claims and the validity of the Restriction Requirement, an election was made. Furthermore, when an election is made, the Examiner must provide a formal restriction requirement in the next Office Action. MPEP 812.01 states:

"When an oral election is made, the examiner will then proceed to incorporate into the Office action **a formal restriction requirement** including the date of the election, the attorney's or agent's name, and a complete record of the

telephone interview, followed by a complete action on the elected *->invention as claimed,< including linking or generic claims if present.” Emphasis added.

Thus, Applicant is providing the Restriction Requirement as discussed with the Examiner:

Group 1 is directed to claims 1-3, where Group 1 is drawn to a line concentrator having a plurality of communication ports for relaying transmissions of communication data exchanged among network-compatible apparatuses connected through the communication ports, and

Group 2 is directed to claims 4-5, where Group 2 is drawn to a network-compatible apparatus.

Groups 1 and 2 are independent and distinct inventions. Thus, Group 1 was selected with traverse.

Applicant again respectfully asks the Examiner to provide a formal Restriction Requirement, so that, Applicant may file a division application if desired. However, if the Examiner does not provide the formal Restriction Requirement, the above Restriction Requirement is provided so that the record reflects the Restriction Requirement discussed with the Examiner and made of record by the Examiner. Further, if Applicant was incorrect in the type of Restriction Requirement made by the Examiner, the Examiner should substitute by amending the Restriction Requirement above.

References need to be provided:

The Examiner stated that there were references the Examiner found that required such a claim amendment. The Examiner stated that he would cite these references with the Examiner's Amendment (some references included Rypinski (U.S. Patent 5,440,560), Kim (U.S. Patent 6,105,143), Dai (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0083356), and Bui (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0126486)). The Examiner did not cite any references in the last correspondence; therefore, Applicant has provided a courtesy letter (including a courtesy SB-08) with some of the

references discussed by the Examiner. However, Applicant again respectfully asks the Examiner to cite all the relevant references that the Examiner found.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that the amendment to claims be entered and the pending application be allowed.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Aslan Ettehadieh Reg. No. 62,278 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.147; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 15, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant